UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/890,253	08/06/2001	Eun Seog Lee	MR2685-91	7861

7590 07/11/2006

Rosenberg Klein & Lee
Suite 101
3458 Ellicott Center Drive
Ellicott City, MD 21043

EXAMINER	
HAILU, TADESSE	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2173	

DATE MAILED: 07/11/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/890,253	LEE, EUN SEOG	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Tadesse Hailu	2173	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *28 April 2006*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,3-5,8,10-13,16,17 and 19-22* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☒ Claim(s) *16,17 and 19-22* is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,3-5,8 and 10-13* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is in response to the Amendment filed April 28, 2006 for the above-identified patent application.

2. The correction made to the Claim Rejections under - 35 USC § 112 has been acknowledged and entered, and the 35 USC § 112 rejections has been withdrawn.

3. The pending claims 1, 3-5, 8, 10-13, 16-17, and 19-22 have been examined herein as follows.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claim 1, 3, 4, 8, and 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bril et al (US Pat No. 6,118,413) in view of Chang (US Pat No 5,563,665).

With regard to claim 1:

Bril discloses a data processing system (see Fig. 2 or 6) using dual monitors (e.g., CRT 695 and LCD (active 680 or passive panel 670), the system comprising:

a memory (620) for providing a data processing area using a program;

at least one or more input means (e.g., pointing device, such as a mouse) for inputting data (column 11, lines 15-33);

a first video graphics adapter (VGA) for generating and outputting screen data for displaying a result processed by at least one or more programs (column 9, lines 55-61);

a second video graphics adapter for generating and outputting screen data for displaying a result processed by at least one or more programs (column 9, lines 61-65);

the result being different from the result processed and displayed by the first VGA (column 10, lines 64-column 11, lines 6);

a processor (211, Fig. 2) for processing data input through the input means using the memory and outputting the processed result through the first and second VGAs (column 7, lines 26-39, column 11, lines 15-33);

a first monitor (e.g., CRT 695, Fig. 6) for displaying screen data output from the first graphics adapter (column 13, lines 4-13);

and a second monitor (e.g., LCD 680) for displaying screen data output from the second graphics adapter (column 13, lines 4-13),

Bril further discloses that the processor (211) displays the processed result (column 10, lines 64-column 11, lines 6) of a main program presently used by a user through the first VGA (Fig. 2, column 9, lines 55-61)and the first monitor, processes information (column 10, lines 64-column 11, lines 6), which is different from the contents displayed on the first monitor (CRT 695)

and input from the outside (e.g., from external), and displays the information through the second VGA (column 9, lines 61-65) and the second monitor, and in case of selecting one of user interfaces displayed through the first or second monitors, displays the processed result on the other monitor (column 10, lines 64-column 11, lines 6).

Bril discloses a television output coupled to said CRT FIFO, for receiving CRT output pixel data and converting said CRT output pixel data into a television display signal. Bril, however, does not explicitly disclose a broadcasting receiving part for receiving television/radio broadcasting waves, ..." as recited in claim 1. Chang, on the other hand discloses a video signal controller having a tuner (18) for generating a broadcast video signal and more particularly to a controller which can be used with a digital computer and a display device (LCD 15 or dual Sync monitor 16) to display the video signal generated by the digital computer (12) and the broadcast video signal generated by the tuner (18) (Chang, *Technical Field*). Similar to Bril and the current invention of claim 1, Chang further discloses that the tuner (18) is connected to a first and second graphic adapters (Col. 2, lines 11-33). The tuner is also connected to the central processing unit (56) and control (40) to control the tuner (18) and transferring audio to the speaker (66) and controls the first and second monitors (col. 2, lines 1-45, col. 4, lines 47-56). Chang and Bril are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, information processing using dual monitor. At the time of the invention, it

would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to add the tuner of Chang with the system since Bril already includes a CRT display for television output adding or incorporating the tuner results in generating a broadcasting signal to be displayed on the CRT display. The suggestion /motivation for doing so would have been to provide a broadcasting signal to the viewer. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Chang with Bril to obtain the invention as specified in claim 1.

With regard to claim 4:

Bril in view of Chang describes connecting the local CPU with an external host (e.g., network) via graphics adapter and providing the information from the external source for display through the second VGA and its associated monitor (Bril, column 7, lines 27-39),

With regard to claim 8:

Bril in view of Chang illustrates that the tuner (18) (or broadcast receiving part) being mounted integrally with one of the first and second monitors (Chang, Fig. 1).

With regard to claim 10:

Bril in view of Chang illustrates that the first and second VGAS and the first and second monitors are connected with one video cable respectively (Bril, Fig. 1, 2, or 6).

With regard to claim 11:

Bril in view of Chang illustrate that the first and second VGAS and the first and second monitors are connected with one video cable, which integrates a plurality of lines for transmitting two video signals into one package (Bril, Fig. 1, 2, or 6).

With regard to claim 12:

Bril in view of Chang illustrate that he first and second VGAS are constructed with a dual VGA having two output ports (Bril, Fig. 2 or 6).

With regard to claim 3:

Both Bril and Change disclose CRT/Dual Sync and LCD/flat panel monitors. Although it is common that LCD monitors are less in screen size that the conventional CRT, but Bril and Chang neither mentioned the size of each screen monitors nor integration of monitors. However, Official notice is taken that it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to make one of the monitor (second monitor, for example) to have a screen size bigger than that of the other screen monitor (first monitor), since such a modification would have involved a mere change or replacement of a component (monitor). A change in size is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art. *In re Rose, 105 USPQ 237 (CCPA 1955)*. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the same time the invention was made to replace one of Bril and Chang monitors with smaller screen size monitor because at least smaller monitors takes less desk space. And one of the monitors of Bril and Chang may be used for main content display.

Furthermore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to integrally or closely mount or assemble the second monitor of Bril with the first monitor of Bril, since it has been held to be within the general skill of a user in the art to make plural parts unitary as a matter of obvious engineering choice. In re Larson, 144 USPQ 347 (CCPA 1965); In re Lockart, 90 USPQ 214 (CCP1 1951).

5. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bril et al (US Pat No. 6,118,413) in view of Chang (US Pat No 5,563,665), Kantor et al (6,025,871) and Wheeler et al (US Pat No. 6,624,797).

With regard to claim 5:

While Bril in view of Chang illustrates peripheral interfaces to interact with CPU (Fig. 2), but Bril in view of Chang does not mention a digital camera and USB port. Kantor, however, discloses a digital camera (108) that can be used with the monitors (113 and 114). It would have been obvious to incorporate Kantor's camera with the multimedia application (Bril, column 1, lines 21-23) of Bril in view of because incorporating the camera will enhance the multimedia application of Bril in view of. Furthermore, neither Bril in view of Chang nor Kantor discloses USB port as claimed in claim 5, Wheeler, however, discloses USB port (Fig.1). Thus, it would have been obvious to include the Wheeler's USB port as one of the peripheral interfaces in Bril in view of Chang's (Bril, Fig. 2), because using the USB port is faster in transferring data to/from a device.

6. Claims 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bril et al (US Pat No. 6,118,413) in view of Chang (US Pat No 5,563,665) Shin (US Pat No. 6,804,724).

With regard to claim 13:

While Bril in view of Chang illustrates several connectors (Bril, Fig. 2), such as connecting VGA card to TV/CRT and LCD, but Bril in view of Chang does not show D-sub connector serving as a video output port, and serving as video input board as claimed in Claim 13. Shin, on the other hand discloses such standard connector having a plurality of pins for processing and transmitting video signals (see he connectors 521 and 522 uses 15-pin D-sub female VGA connectors, Fig. 5, column 5, lines 46-61). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the Shin's D-connectors in place of Bril in view of Chang connectors because the D-sub connectors as described in Shin are the standard and widely used connectors, therefore they will be available and compatible with a plurality of devices to work with.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Allowable Subject Matter

8. As given reasons in the previous office action, the pending claims 16, 17, 19, and 20-22 are allowed.

CONCLUSION

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

10. Examiner has pointed out particular references contained in the prior arts of record in the body of this action for the convenience of the applicant. Although the spec6ed citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and Figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant, in preparing the response, to consider fully the entire references as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior arts or disclosed by the examiner.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Tadesse Hailu, whose telephone number is (571) 272-4051. The Examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 10:30 – 7:00 ET. If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Kincaid, Kristine, can be reached at (571) 272-4063 Art Unit 2173 and 2174.

Patent Examiner Tadesse Hailu
Art Unit 2173- operating interface
7/5/06

TADESSE HAILU
Patent Examiner